

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Desmond E. Wong	Examiner: Vijay Shankar
Serial No.: 09/432,855	Art Unit: 2629
Filing Date: November 2, 1999	Our File No.: 00100.99.0136
Confirmation No.: 1672	Docket No.: 0100.9901360
Title: <b>METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DETECTING A FLAT PANEL DISPLAY MONITOR</b>	

---

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REMARKS FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections include clear errors because one or more claim limitations are not met by the cited references and the references do not teach what the Examiner alleges.

Claims 1-6, 10-13 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cho et al. In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Cho recites and discloses a connector coupled to a flat panel display (fig. 1, Col. 3, lines 3-31; Col. 5, lines 18 --- Col. 6, line 30; Col. 9, lines 17-37)." However, FIG. 1 and the cited portions do not show a connector coupled to a flat panel display. To the contrary, the flat panel 60 is shown being connected to the graphics processor 40 as also described in column 3, lines 3-7. There is no connector coupled to a flat panel display in Cho. In fact, it appears that the display in Cho is integrated as part of the laptop. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims passed to allowance.

Cho is directed to a system having a portable computer and a docking station. An interface is coupled between the portable computer and the docking station that is responsive to

unpreconditioned insertion and removal of the portable computer into or from the docking station. When the portable computer is being inserted into or removed from the docking station, the interface generates events to allow software to configure the portable computer and the docking station without prior user intervention. Applicant claims a completely different method and apparatus. As to claims 1 and 23, the claims are directed to a method and apparatus for detecting a monitor. The office action cites FIG. 1 of Cho. However, no such method is disclosed. To the contrary, Cho describes a method for detecting a portable computer being inserted with a docking station.

The claimed method requires monitoring one pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display. As best understood, however, Cho only describes pins such as CD1# pin 201, CD2# pin 202, signal pins 203, a battery-charge pin 204, a ds\_Vcc5 pin 205, NB\_switched\_Vcc5 pin 206, and ground pins 207. (*See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 38-42.) None of these pins appear to be coupled to a flat panel display, as claimed in claim 1, for example. (*See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 50-62 (describing the function of each pin).) Thus, as best understood, Cho certainly could not teach “monitoring one pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display” because Cho does not teach a pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display.

Although the claim is allowable for one or more of these reasons, Applicant also respectfully notes that the claim requires among other things, asserting an output signal to indicate the one pin connected to the flat panel display is in a first state and receiving the output signal at a display engine. The office action cites column 10, lines 5-40; figure 1; column 3, lines 3-31; column 5, line 18 through column 6, line 30; and column 9, lines 17-37. However, the cited portions merely describe the docking station 102 having a plurality of connector pins that connect with the personal computer, none of which deal with the flat panel display because

the flat panel display is not connected to the docking station (see FIG. 1). Although Cho does appear to describe asserting a signal, DS\_PWRSW, in response to a pin, such as pin CD1#, the pin is not a pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display, as previously noted. This is because Cho is directed to a portable computer that is inserted into a docking station and is not concerned with a pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display.

Moreover, the office action alleges that the graphic controller 40 receives an output signal from the one pin of a connector that is coupled to the flat panel display. However, upon review of the reference, it does not appear that any such output signal is received by the graphics controller 40 and the cited portion appears silent as to the subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 25, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above and also notes that the office action alleges that Cho teaches determining when an external flat panel display becomes available by monitoring at least one pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display citing columns 3, 4 and 5. However, these cited portions do not appear to refer to determining when an external flat panel display becomes available by monitoring a pin of a connector that is coupled to a flat panel display as claimed. To the contrary, the cited portions appear to merely describe the various docking station pins in the docking station, none of which appear to be directed to the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn due to clear error and the claim should be passed to allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested  
and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-20-07

By: Christopher J. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 609-7500  
FAX: (312) 609-5005